REMARKS

Claims 1-14 remain pending in the application.

35 USC 112 First Paragraph Rejection of Claim 1

The Office Action rejected claim 1 as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement under 35 USC 112. In particular, the Examiner alleged that it is unclear how the unit slides over all the surfaces as claimed.

Applicants are not claiming a novel system for sliding two parts over one another that would require a description in the Applicants' disclosure to support such claims. Thus, Applicants have not provided a disclosure of how the claimed encryption unit slides over the claimed surfaces since Applicants are not claiming a novel method of sliding. Any method of sliding can be used with Applicants' invention. As Applicants' disclose, the Applicants' invention is directed towards a removable encryption unit and not a novel method of sliding. To the extent that sliding is being claimed, the Applicants' disclosure supports an encryption unit that slides into place on page 4, lines 17-27.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is in full conformance with 35 USC 112. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-14 over Schmitt in view of Corfits and AAPA

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,652,695 to Schmitt et al. ("Scmitt") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,853,830 to Corfits et al. ("Corfits") and Applicants' Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Applicants respectfully suggest the need to combine THREE references is an indication of the non-obviousness of claims 1-14.

Claims 1-14 recite a rear surface that is movably secured in a rear of a mounting bracket so as to allow for a given amount of left/right and up/down tolerance in alignment between at least four mounted connectors mounted on the rear surface and a matching at least four connectors on a rear of an encryption

unit to be slid over a top surface, a bottom surface, a left surface, and a right surface, and into connection with the at least four mounted connectors.

The Examiner acknowledged that Schmitt fails to disclose a plurality of connectors (see Office Action, page 3). The reason Schmitt fails to disclose a plurality of connectors is that Schmitt's invention is directed toward a hard drive carrier, i.e., a metal cage that a hard drive is attached to (see Fig. 2). A metal cage does not require connectors since lacking any circuitry that would benefit from connectors. Thus, modification of Schmitt with the acknowledged deficiency in Schmitt is nonsensical since modifying a metal cage that lacks any type of circuitry with connectors would not provide any functionality to the metal cage. Thus, even if the Examiner provides prior art that discloses a plurality of connectors, modification of Scmitt with any prior art that discloses a plurality of connectors is nonsensical and a non-obvious modification of Schmitt.

Moreover, the Examiner alleged that Schmitt discloses a connector (see Office Action, page 3). However, the connector that Schmitt discloses is simply an interface that is unconnected to the metal cage and sits between a hard drive that can be attached to a metal cage and a computer interface (see Fig. 7A and Fig. 8). Schmitt's connector is not connected to an encryption unit. Thus, Schmitt's metal cage and/or connector must be modified to perform some type of encryption to meet the claimed limitations. Modifying a metal cage and/or connector to perform encryption is nonsensical since modifying a metal cage and/or connector that lacks any type of circuitry to perform encryption would not provide any functionality to the metal cage and/or connector. Thus, even if the Examiner provides prior art that discloses an encryption unit, modification of Scmitt with any prior art that discloses an encryption unit is nonsensical and an unobvious modification of Schmitt.

The Examiner relied on Corfits to allegedly disclose a plurality of connectors (see Office Action, pages 3 and 4). However, the Examiner is ignoring the context of Corfits. Corfits discloses a plurality of connectors used to connect an enclosure and a circuit board (see Fig. 4). The Examiner acknowledged that Corfits fails to disclose an encryption unit (see Office Action,

page 4). Thus, the Examiner is taking Applicants' claimed features completely out of context from the other claimed features. Corfits fails to make up for the deficiencies in Schmitt, i.e., fails to disclose or suggest application of any of his teachings to an encryption unit, as recited by claims 1-14.

The Examiner relied on AAPA to disclose an encryption unit having multi-connectors located at a rear surface of the unit (see Office Action, page 4). AAPA discloses a deficiency with the art of having an encryption unit that is integrated with a conventional deployable secure communication system. Thus, AAPA teaches away from a detachable encryption unit since specifically disclosing an integrated encryption unit. The Examiner is again taking the relied on reference out of context. AAPA fails to suggest an encryption unit that slides into position, i.e., at least four connectors on a rear of an encryption unit to be slid over a top surface, a bottom surface, a left surface, and a right surface, and into connection with at least four mounted connectors, as recited by claims 1-14.

Moreover, the motivation the Examiner provided for modifying Schmitt with AAPA is "to provide a carrier structure with blind mating capabilities (see, col. 4, liens 32-35 of Schmitt), for any electronic component, such as an encryption unit." (see Office Action, page 4) However, the Examiner's motivation fails to provide a reason why one skilled in the art would modify Schmitt with an encryption unit. As discussed above, modifying Schmitt's metal cage and/or connector to perform encryption is nonsensical since modifying a metal cage and/or connector that lacks any type of circuitry to perform encryption would not provide any functionality to the metal cage and/or connector.

Thus, Schmitt modified by Corfits and AAPA fails to disclose or suggest a rear surface that is movably secured in a rear of a mounting bracket so as to allow for a given amount of left/right and up/down tolerance in alignment between at least four mounted connectors mounted on the rear surface and a matching at least four connectors on a rear of an encryption unit to be slid over a top surface, a bottom surface, a left surface, and a right surface, and into connection with the at least four mounted connectors, as recited by claims 1-14.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-14 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and/or rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Bollman
Reg. No.: 36,457
Tel. (202) 261-1020
Fax. (202) 887-0336

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W. 7th Floor
Washington D.C. 20036-3307
WHB/df